



Michigan Department of Natural Resources
Wildlife Division Report No. 3529
October 2011

Printed by Authority of: P.A. 451 of 1994
Total Number of Copies Printed:25
Cost per Copy:\$1.68
Total Cost:\$42.00
Michigan Department of Natural Resources

2010 MICHIGAN ELK HUNTER SURVEY

Brian J. Frawley

ABSTRACT

Elk hunters were contacted after the 2010 hunting season to estimate hunter participation, hunter satisfaction, and elk seen and harvested. In 2010, an estimated 225 hunters spent about 850 days afield. Hunters reported 3,541 elk observations (\bar{x} = 15.7 elk seen /hunter), and they harvested 162 elk. About 72% of hunters harvested an elk in 2010. The average number of days required to harvest an elk was 5.3 days. About 74% of hunters rated their overall hunting experience as very good or good. Nearly 70% of elk hunters (158) had a hunting guide assist with their hunt, and most of these hunters (85%) indicated guides increased the quality of their elk hunt.

INTRODUCTION

Elk (*Cervus elaphus*) were extirpated from Michigan in about 1875 (Murie 1951). The current elk herd was the result of a release of seven animals from various city parks and public institutions in 1918 about three miles southeast of Wolverine (Stephenson 1942). The herd grew steadily with estimates of 300-400 in 1939 (Shapton 1940) and 900 to 1,000 in 1958 (Moran 1973). During 1964-1965, 477 elk were harvested during limited elk hunting seasons to reduce crop damage; however, annual hunting seasons were not initiated until 1984. The objectives of the annual elk hunts were to balance elk numbers and distribution with ecological, economic, and social concerns. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) annually sets license quotas for hunts with a goal of maintaining an elk population between 800 and 900 animals during the winter in the NLP.

A limited number of hunters have been allowed to hunt elk in Michigan each year since 1984. Between 1984 and 2004, applicants for hunts each year had the same probability of being



A contribution of Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, Michigan Project W-147-R

Equal Rights for Natural Resource Users

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources provides equal opportunities for employment and access to Michigan's natural resources. Both State and Federal laws prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, religion, disability, age, sex, height, weight or marital status under the U.S. Civil Rights Acts of 1964 as amended, 1976 MI PA 453, 1976 MI PA 220, Title V of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 as amended, and the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, as amended.

If you believe that you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility, or if you desire additional information, please write:
Human Resources, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, PO Box 30473, Lansing MI 48909-7973, or
Michigan Department of Civil Rights, Cadillac Place, 3054 West Grand Blvd, Suite 3-600, Detroit, MI 48202, or
Division of Federal Assistance, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Mail Stop MBSP-4020, Arlington, VA 22203.

For information or assistance on this publication, contact Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, P.O. Box 30444, MI 48909.
This publication is available in alternative formats upon request.

selected for a license (i.e., simple random selection among eligible applicants). In 2005, a new random weighted lottery system was adopted, which gave people applying for many years a higher probability of being selected than people applying fewer years, although licensees were selected by region of residence in the same proportion as applications were received. This system was designed to provide some advantage to multi-year applicants while continuing to provide an opportunity to new applicants. This system assigned applicants a chance (opportunity to be selected) each year they had applied. Thus, a person applying in 2008, 2009, and 2010 would have three chances to be selected in the 2010 drawing, while someone only applying in 2010 would have just one chance. Applicants also had the option to purchase a chance only rather than applying for a license, thus increasing the probability of being selected in future drawings.

Two types of elk hunting licenses (Any Elk and Antlerless Only) were allocated among applicants using two separate drawings (one drawing for each license type) in 2010. Only Michigan residents who were at least 12 years of age before or during the hunt period could apply for licenses. When people applied for an elk license, they indicated whether they were willing to harvest only an antlered bull elk or whether they were willing to harvest either an antlered bull or antlerless elk. The first drawing (drawing for an Any Elk license) included all applicants. Applicants successful in the Any Elk license drawing could purchase a license entitling them to take either an antlered bull (male elk) or antlerless elk (female elk or calf). The second drawing (Antlerless Only license drawing) allocated antlerless-only elk licenses among applicants that had indicated they were willing to take an antlerless elk. Those successful in the Antlerless Only license drawing could only harvest an antlerless elk. A person issued an antlerless-only elk license was ineligible for an elk license for 10 years, while a person issued an any-elk license was ineligible for any type of elk hunting license during the remainder of their life.

The Pure Michigan Hunt (PMH) was a unique multi-species hunting opportunity offered for the first time in 2010. Individuals could purchase an unlimited number of applications for the PMH. Three individuals were randomly chosen from all applications, and winners received elk, bear, spring turkey, fall turkey, and antlerless deer hunting licenses and could participate in a reserved waterfowl hunt on a managed waterfowl area. The elk hunting licenses were valid for all areas open for hunting elk and during all elk hunting periods. Furthermore, the PMH license holder could hunt any season until their elk harvest tag was filled.

In 2010, elk could be taken during twelve hunt periods, in addition to the Pure Michigan Hunt (Table 1). After the drawing, the DNR assigned successful applicants to their hunt period and elk management unit, except elk hunters assigned to hunt in elk management units A, B, C, or F could also hunt in elk Management Unit X (Figure 1). All successful applicants were required to attend a half-day orientation session the day before the hunt. Upon completion of this training, each successful applicant was issued their elk license along with other pertinent hunt information.

In 2010, the DNR allocated 230 licenses among 34,981 eligible applicants, excluding the PMH drawing (Table 1). Licenses were valid on all land ownership types. Hunters could only harvest one elk, and hunters with an antlerless-only license could not take an elk with antlers. Elk could be harvested with a firearm, crossbow, or archery equipment. Hunters 12-years-old

or older could use a crossbow to hunt elk. Hunters using a crossbow were required to obtain a free crossbow stamp, except hunters with a disability already hunting under a DNR-issued crossbow permit did not need the stamp. Hunters could not use bait (e.g., grain, fruit, vegetables) to attract elk. Successful hunters were required to take their elk to an official checking station within 24 hours of killing an elk.

The DNR and Natural Resources Commission have the authority and responsibility to protect and manage the wildlife resources of the state of Michigan. Harvest surveys are one of the management tools used by the DNR to accomplish its statutory responsibility. Estimating harvest, hunting effort, and hunter satisfaction are among the primary objectives of these surveys. Estimates derived from harvest surveys, as well as harvest reported by hunters at mandatory checking stations, and other indices, are used to monitor elk populations and establish harvest regulations.

METHODS

Following the 2010 elk hunting season, a questionnaire (Appendix A) was sent to everyone who obtained an elk hunting license for the 2010 hunting season (227 licensees). License buyers receiving the questionnaire were asked to report whether they hunted, number of days spent afield, hunt location, the number of elk seen, whether they harvested an elk, and the type of hunting equipment used. Hunters also reported whether other hunters caused interference during their hunt. Successful hunters were asked to report harvest location, sex of the elk taken, and type of hunting equipment used. Hunters also were asked to report how satisfied they were with the number of elk seen, number of opportunities they had to take an elk, and their overall elk hunting experience.

Although estimating harvest, hunter numbers, and hunting effort were the primary objectives of the harvest survey, this survey also provided an opportunity to collect information about management issues. Questions were added to determine how frequently hunters were assisted by hunting guides and what services were provided by these guides. In addition, hunters were asked about satisfaction with the mandatory hunter orientation session and hunting guides.

Estimates were calculated using a stratified random sampling design that included fourteen strata (Cochran 1977). Hunters were stratified based on their license type and the hunt period and unit for which their license was valid (14 hunts, Table 1). The estimate of the mean number of days required to harvest an elk was calculated using a different ratio for each stratum (i.e., separate ratio estimator). The number of elk registered from each stratum was used as an auxiliary variate to improve the precision of ratio estimates.

A 95% confidence limit (CL) was calculated for each estimate. In theory, the CL can be added and subtracted from the estimate to calculate the 95% confidence interval. The confidence interval is a measure of the precision associated with the estimate and implies that the true value would be within this interval 95 times out of 100. Unfortunately, there are several other possible sources of error in surveys that are probably more serious than theoretical calculations of sampling error. They include failure of participants to provide answers

(nonresponse bias), question wording, and question order. It is very difficult to measure these biases; thus, estimates were not adjusted for these possible biases.

Statistical tests are used routinely to determine the likelihood that the differences among estimates are larger than expected by chance alone. The overlap of 95% confidence intervals was used to determine whether estimates differed. Non-overlapping 95% confidence intervals was equivalent to stating that the difference between the means was larger than would be expected 995 out of 1,000 times, if the study had been repeated (Payton et al. 2003).

Questionnaires were mailed initially during late January 2011, and up to two follow-up questionnaires were mailed to nonrespondents. Questionnaires were returned by 207 people, yielding a 91% response rate.

RESULTS

In 2010, 227 elk hunting licenses were purchased (Table 1), a 38% decrease from 2009 (366). Most of the people buying a license in 2010 were men (92%), and the average age of the license buyers was 51 years (Figure 2). About 5% of the license buyers (11) were younger than 17 years old. Among the license buyers that hunted elk in 2010, the average number of years they had hunted in Michigan was 32 ± 1 years. In addition, $34 \pm 2\%$ of these hunters had hunted elk (including outside of Michigan) prior to 2010.

Nearly $99 \pm 1\%$ of the license buyers hunted elk (Table 2). These hunters spent 850 days afield ($\bar{x} = 3.8$ days/hunter). Hunters reported 3,541 elk observations ($\bar{x} = 15.7$ elk seen/hunter), and they harvested an estimated 162 elk. (Elk seen does not represent different animals seen because elk could be double counted and reported by multiple hunters.) Otsego County was the county with the highest number of elk hunters and elk harvested during 2010 (Table 3). The average number of days required to harvest an elk for all hunts was 5.3 days in 2010 (Table 2).

About 25% of the elk hunters hunted on private lands only in 2010, 31% hunted on public lands only, and 42% hunted on both private and public lands (Table 4). Elk hunters spent 201 days afield on private land only, 227 days hunting on public land only, and 422 days hunting on both private and public lands (Table 5). Of the estimated 162 elk harvested in 2010, 49% of these elk (80) were taken on private land. About 51% of harvested elk (82) were taken on public land (Table 6).

Of the elk harvested, 42% were males (66) and 58% were females (95; Table 7). Overall, 72% of hunters harvested an elk in 2010 (Table 2). Hunter success ranged from 39-100% among the hunt periods (Table 2).

Most hunters ($99 \pm 1\%$) used firearms while hunting elk, and all elk (100%) were taken with a firearm. About 1% of hunters used either a crossbow or archery equipment (compound, recurve, or long bows). Moving the harvested elk from the kill site to a vehicle was accomplished by $40 \pm 2\%$ of the hunters. While $64 \pm 2\%$ of the hunters received assistance from a hunting companion; $63 \pm 2\%$ of the hunters had assistance from a hunting guide; $10 \pm 1\%$ of the hunters had assistance from a landowner; and $11 \pm 1\%$ of the hunters received

assistance from a DNR employee. Most successful hunters ($56 \pm 2\%$) registered their elk at a registration station, but nearly $43 \pm 2\%$ of elk were registered in the field by a DNR employee. The registration location was not reported by 1% of hunters.

About 51% of elk hunters rated the number of elk seen during the 2010 hunting season as very good or good, and 30% rated elk seen as poor or very poor (Table 8). Similarly, about 42% of hunters rated the number of chances they had to take an elk during the 2010 hunting season as very good or good, and 32% rated their chances as poor or very poor (Table 9).

About 74% of hunters rated their hunting experiences as very good or good, and 13% rated their hunting experiences as poor or very poor (Table 10). Hunter satisfaction was affected by many factors such as hunting success and whether hunting activities were completed without interference (Figure 3). In 2010, 10% of the hunters reported that interference was a major problem, while 24% experienced minor levels of interference (Table 11). Among hunters reporting interference (major and minor interference combined), the most common source of interference was another elk hunter ($68 \pm 4\%$), while $22 \pm 3\%$ of interfered hunters reported interference from other types of hunters.

Nearly 70% of elk hunters (157) had a hunting guide assist with their hunt (Table 12). Most hunters using a guide ($60 \pm 2\%$) reported their guide was always with them when they were hunting elk. Another $19 \pm 2\%$ of hunters with guides indicated their guide was present 75-99% of the time while hunting, and $3 \pm 1\%$ of hunters reported their guide accompanied them 50-74% of the time. In contrast, about $16 \pm 2\%$ of hunters using guides reported their guide was with them in the field less than 50% of the time.

Among the hunters using a hunting guide, 82% of hunters (130) paid for the services provided by a guide. Hunters using guides most frequently (91%) paid between \$101 and \$1,000 for the guide services. Hunting guides most frequently provided hunting advice (83%) and selected the hunt area (85%, Table 13),

The ability to provide a hunt area having elk (94%) and providing an area with a good chance of taking an elk (94%) were among the most important services wanted by hunters that had used a guide (Table 14). In addition, hunters using guides wanted their guide to use ethical hunting methods (92%). Having a guide with access to private lands was also important to most hunters (67%). Guide services such as providing hunting equipment (e.g., off-road vehicles), lodging, and food were generally not important factors for most hunters using a guide.

Overall, most hunters using a guide indicated that their guide had either greatly increased ($65 \pm 2\%$) or had increased ($20 \pm 2\%$) the quality of their elk hunt. In contrast, $11 \pm 2\%$ were neutral with their guide's service, and only $2 \pm 1\%$ of hunters indicated that their guide had decreased or greatly decreased the quality of their hunt.

Most hunters using a guide were satisfied by their guides' ability to provide a hunting area having elk (88%) and to provide an area where they had a chance to harvest an elk (84%, Table 15). In addition, most hunters (90%) indicated that their hunting guide used ethical hunting methods.

Most hunters indicated they were satisfied by the content of the DNR orientation session (84%, Table 16). Furthermore, most hunters ($\geq 76\%$) were satisfied by the facilities where the session occurred, the session length, and the handouts provided at the session.

When requested by hunters, DNR has opened gates to provide access for hunters to retrieve their elk from state land. Hunters were asked whether the DNR should continue to provide this service. Most hunters ($93 \pm 1\%$) indicated the DNR should continue to provide this service. Less than 1% of elk hunters disagreed with providing this service, and $3 \pm 1\%$ of hunters were not sure about continuing this service.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank all the elk hunters that provided information. Theresa Riebow and Hannah Schauer completed data entry. The figure of elk management units and the area open to hunting was prepared by Marshall Strong. Russ Mason, Brian Mastenbrook, Cheryl Nelson, Doug Reeves, Mark Sargent, and Brent Rudolph reviewed a previous version of this report.

LITERATURE CITED

- Cochran, W. G. 1977. Sampling techniques. John Wiley & Sons, New York. USA.
- Moran, R. J. 1973. The rocky mountain elk in Michigan. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division Report. 267, Lansing, Michigan. USA.
- Murie, O. J. 1951. The elk of North America. Stackpole Books, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, USA.
- Payton, M. E., M. H. Greenstone, and N. Schenker. 2003. Overlapping confidence intervals or standard error intervals: what do they mean in terms of statistical significance? Journal of Insect Science 3:34.
- Shapton, W. 1940. Report of an elk survey in the Pigeon River State Forest during the deer hunting season, 1939. Game Division Report 498. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, USA.
- Stephenson, J. H. 1942. Michigan elk. Game Division Report 994. Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, USA.

2010 Elk Management Units Aug. /Sept. Hunt and Oct. Hunt



2010 Elk Management Units Dec. Hunt




Figure 1. Elk management units open to hunting in Michigan, 2010




Figure 2. Age of people that purchased an elk hunting license in Michigan for the 2010 hunting season ($\bar{x} = 51$ years). Licenses were purchased by 227 people.




Figure 3. Estimated hunter satisfaction, hunting success, and level of hunter interference in Michigan's management units during the 2010 elk hunting season. Satisfaction measures the proportion of hunters rating their hunting experiences as very good or good. Interference was the proportion of hunters that reported major interference. Error bars represent the 95% confidence limit.

Table 1. Number of people purchasing hunting licenses for the 2010 Michigan elk hunting seasons, summarized by hunt.

Hunt	Elk type ^a	Management unit ^b	Hunt dates	License quota	Licenses sold ^c
1101	Any elk	L	08/31-9/03/10 & 9/24-27/10	20	20
1201	Any elk	L	10/16/10 - 10/20/10	20	20
1301	Any elk	A	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	10	10
1302	Any elk	B	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	10	10
1303	Any elk	C	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	5	5
1304	Any elk	F	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	10	10
2101	Antlerless elk	L	08/31-9/03/10 & 9/24-27/10	40	38
2201	Antlerless elk	L	10/16/10 - 10/20/10	40	40
2301	Antlerless elk	A	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	10	10
2302	Antlerless elk	B	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	30	28
2303	Antlerless elk	C	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	5	5
2304	Antlerless elk	F	12/04/10 - 12/12/10	30	28
2010	Pure Michigan Hunt ^d	All	All dates	3	3

^aHunters selected for an Any Elk license or Pure Michigan Hunt could harvest either an antlered bull elk or an antlerless elk. Hunters selected for an Antlerless Elk license could harvest an antlerless elk only.

^bSee Figure 1 for location of management units.

^cFewer licenses were sold than the number available because some successful applicants failed to purchase a license.

^dPure Michigan Hunt licenses were valid in all seasons and areas open for hunting elk.

Table 2. Estimated number of hunters, harvest, hunter success, hunting effort, and mean days hunted during the 2010 Michigan elk hunting season, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit ^a	Hunters		Harvest		Hunter success		Hunting effort		Days hunted per hunter (\bar{x})		Days hunted per harvested elk (\bar{x})	
	No.	95% CL ^b	No.	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b	Days	95% CL ^b	Days	95% CL ^a	Days	95% CL ^b
1101 – L	20	<1	19	1	94	3	90	11	4.5	0.6	4.8	0.6
1201 – L	20	<1	14	1	72	7	61	8	3.1	0.4	4.2	0.8
1301 – A	10	0	9	0	90	0	35	0	3.5	0.0	3.9	0.0
1302 – B	10	0	9	0	90	0	23	0	2.3	0.0	2.6	0.0
1303 – C	5	0	5	0	100	0	21	0	4.2	0.0	4.2	0.0
1304 – F	10	<1	9	1	89	7	43	8	4.3	0.8	4.9	0.8
2101 – L	38	<1	25	2	66	4	159	9	4.2	0.2	6.3	0.7
2201 – L	40	<1	16	3	39	7	160	10	4.0	0.3	10.2	1.9
2301 – A	9	1	9	1	100	<1	26	4	2.9	0.4	2.9	0.4
2302 – B	27	<1	21	1	77	3	91	4	3.4	0.1	4.4	0.2
2303 – C	5	0	4	0	80	0	13	0	2.6	0.0	3.3	0.0
2304 – F	28	<1	19	2	68	6	99	9	3.5	0.3	5.2	0.6
2010 – All	3	0	3	0	100	0	30	0	10.0	0.0	10.0	0.0
All hunts ^c	225	1	162	4	72	2	850	23	3.8	0.1	5.3	0.3

^aEither an antlered bull elk or an antlerless elk could be taken in hunts 1101-1304 and 2010, while only antlerless elk could be taken in hunts 2101-2304.

^b95% confidence limits.

^cColumn totals may not equal totals for all hunts because of rounding error.

Table 2 (continued). Estimated number of elk seen, average number of elk seen per hunter, hunter satisfaction, and proportion of hunters reporting interference while hunting during the 2010 Michigan elk hunting season, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Elk seen ^a		Elk seen per hunter (\bar{x})		Hunter satisfaction ^b		Interfered hunters ^c	
	No.	95% CL ^d	No.	95% CL ^d	%	95% CL ^d	%	95% CL ^d
1101 – L	183	29	9.2	1.4	94	3	6	3
1201 – L	173	26	8.7	1.3	67	7	22	6
1301 – A	238	0	23.8	0.0	80	0	0	0
1302 – B	141	0	14.1	0.0	90	0	0	0
1303 – C	42	0	8.4	0.0	80	0	0	0
1304 – F	217	46	21.7	4.6	67	10	22	9
2101 – L	383	43	10.1	1.1	74	4	9	3
2201 – L	327	60	8.2	1.5	45	7	18	6
2301 – A	277	48	31.1	4.9	100	0	13	8
2302 – B	921	86	34.2	3.2	88	2	4	1
2303 – C	41	0	8.2	0.0	80	0	0	0
2304 – F	540	64	19.3	2.3	80	5	4	3
2010 – All	58	0	19.3	0.0	67	0	0	0
All hunts ^e	3,541	152	15.7	0.7	74	2	10	1

^aElk seen does not represent different animals seen because elk could be double counted and reported by multiple hunters.

^bSatisfaction measures the proportion of hunters rating their hunting experiences as very good or good.

^cInterference was the proportion of hunters that reported major interference.

^d95% confidence limits.

^eColumn totals may not equal totals for all hunts because of rounding error.

Table 3. Estimated number of hunters, harvest, hunter success, and hunting effort during the 2010 Michigan elk hunting season, summarized by county.

County	Hunters		Harvest		Hunter success		Hunting effort	
	No. ^a	95% CL ^b	No. ^a	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b	Days ^a	95% CL ^b
Alpena	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antrim	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charlevoix	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cheboygan	72	4	41	4	57	4	227	19
Crawford	1	<1	0	0	0	0	6	<1
Emmet	1	1	1	1	100	0	1	1
Montmorency	80	4	46	2	58	3	268	16
Oscoda	1	<1	0	0	0	0	3	<1
Otsego	99	5	71	4	72	3	257	17
Presque Isle	11	2	2	1	20	8	28	7
Unknown	21	3	0	0	0	0	59	12

^aColumn totals may not equal totals for all hunts because of rounding error.

^b95% confidence limits.

Table 3 (continued). Estimated hunter satisfaction, hunt interference, elk seen, and average number of elk seen per hunter during the 2010 Michigan elk hunting season, summarized by county.

County	Hunter satisfaction ^{a,b}		Interfered Hunters ^{a,c}		Elk seen ^{a,d}		Elk seen per hunter (\bar{x})	
	%	95% CL ^e	%	95% CL ^e	No.	95% CL ^e	No.	95% CL ^e
Alpena ^f	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Antrim ^f	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Charlevoix ^f	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0
Cheboygan	79	4	16	3	827	95	11.5	1.1
Crawford	0	0	0	0	20	0	20.0	0.0
Emmet	100	0	0	0	1	1	1.0	0.0
Montmorency	80	3	6	2	1,228	95	15.3	1.2
Oscoda	100	0	0	0	18	0	18.0	0.0
Otsego	77	3	10	2	1,306	100	13.2	0.9
Presque Isle	79	9	10	6	32	11	2.9	0.8
Unknown	42	7	21	6	109	25	5.2	1.1

^aColumn totals may not equal totals for all hunts because of rounding error.

^bSatisfaction measures the proportion of hunters rating their hunting experiences as very good or good.

^cInterference was the proportion of hunters that reported major interference.

^dElk seen does not represent different animals seen because elk could be double counted and reported by multiple hunters.

^e95% confidence limits.

^fNo hunters reported hunting elk in this county.

Table 4. Estimated number and proportion of hunters hunting on private and public lands during the 2010 elk hunting season, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Land type															
	Private land only				Public land only				Both private and public lands				Unknown land			
	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	3	1	17	6	7	1	33	7	10	2	50	8	0	0	0	0
1201 – L	4	1	22	6	7	1	33	7	8	1	39	7	1	1	6	3
1301 – A	1	0	10	0	4	0	40	0	5	0	50	0	0	0	0	0
1302 – B	5	0	50	0	4	0	40	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	10	0
1303 – C	1	0	20	0	2	0	40	0	2	0	40	0	0	0	0	0
1304 – F	0	0	0	0	3	1	33	10	7	1	67	10	0	0	0	0
2101 – L	14	2	37	5	5	1	14	3	18	2	49	5	0	0	0	0
2201 – L	12	3	30	7	10	2	24	6	18	3	45	7	0	0	0	0
2301 – A	2	1	25	10	6	1	63	11	1	1	13	8	0	0	0	0
2302 – B	6	1	23	3	10	1	38	4	8	1	31	3	2	1	8	2
2303 – C	1	0	20	0	3	0	60	0	1	0	20	0	0	0	0	0
2304 – F	6	1	20	5	9	2	32	6	12	2	44	7	1	1	4	3
2010 – All	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
All hunts	56	4	25	2	70	4	31	2	56	5	42	2	5	1	2	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 5. Estimated number of days of hunting effort on private and public lands during the 2010 Michigan elk hunting season, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Land type							
	Private lands		Public lands		Both private and public lands		Unknown	
	Days	95% CL ^a	Days	95% CL ^a	Days	95% CL ^a	Days	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	14	4	21	6	54	12	0	0
1201 – L	4	1	18	5	39	9	0	0
1301 – A	4	0	13	0	18	0	0	0
1302 – B	12	0	11	0	0	0	0	0
1303 – C	1	0	10	0	10	0	0	0
1304 – F	3	2	6	2	34	8	0	0
2101 – L	66	9	13	3	79	10	0	0
2201 – L	48	10	42	11	69	13	0	0
2301 – A	4	2	19	5	2	1	0	0
2302 – B	22	3	34	3	35	4	0	0
2303 – C	6	0	4	0	3	0	0	0
2304 – F	15	5	29	7	55	10	0	0
2010 – All	0	0	7	0	23	0	0	0
All hunts	201	15	227	17	422	26	0	0

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 6. Land type when elk were harvested during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Land type											
	Private land				Public land				Unknown			
	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	Total	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	53	8	10	2	47	8	9	1	0	0	0	0
1201 – L	46	9	7	1	54	9	8	1	0	0	0	0
1301 – A	44	0	4	0	56	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
1302 – B	56	0	5	0	44	0	4	0	0	0	0	0
1303 – C	40	0	2	0	60	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
1304 – F	50	12	4	1	50	12	4	1	0	0	0	0
2101 – L	57	6	14	2	43	6	11	2	0	0	0	0
2201 – L	69	11	11	3	31	11	5	2	0	0	0	0
2301 – A	25	10	2	1	75	10	7	1	0	0	0	0
2302 – B	40	4	8	1	60	4	12	1	0	0	0	0
2303 – C	25	0	1	0	75	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
2304 – F	47	8	9	2	53	8	10	2	0	0	0	0
2010 – All	67	0	2	0	33	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
All hunts	49	2	80	4	51	2	82	4	0	0	0	0

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 7. Proportion and number of elk harvested by sex during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit ^a	Sex of harvested elk							
	Male				Female			
	%	95% CL ^b	No.	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b	No.	95% CL ^b
1101 – L	94	4	18	1	6	4	1	1
1201 – L	92	5	13	1	8	5	1	1
1301 – A	100	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
1302 – B	100	0	9	0	0	0	0	0
1303 – C	100	0	5	0	0	0	0	0
1304 – F	88	8	8	1	13	8	1	1
2101 – L	4	2	1	1	96	2	24	2
2201 – L	0	0	0	0	100	0	16	3
2301 – A	0	0	0	0	100	0	9	1
2302 – B	0	0	0	0	100	0	21	1
2303 – C	0	0	0	0	100	0	4	0
2304 – F	6	4	1	1	94	4	18	2
2010 – All	100	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
All hunts	42	1	67	2	58	1	95	4

^aEither an antlered bull elk or an antlerless elk could be taken in hunts 1101-1304 and 2010, while only antlerless elk could be taken in hunts 2101-2304.

^b95% confidence limits.

Table 8. Hunters' level of satisfaction with the number of elk seen during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Satisfaction level							
	Very good/good		Neutral		Poor/very poor		No answer or not applicable	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	61	7	17	6	22	6	0	0
1201 – L	50	8	11	5	39	7	0	0
1301 – A	70	0	10	0	20	0	0	0
1302 – B	70	0	20	0	10	0	0	0
1303 – C	60	0	0	0	20	0	20	0
1304 – F	44	11	33	10	22	9	0	0
2101 – L	40	5	20	4	37	5	3	2
2201 – L	18	6	15	5	58	7	9	4
2301 – A	75	10	25	10	0	0	0	0
2302 – B	85	3	4	1	12	2	0	0
2303 – C	40	0	20	0	40	0	0	0
2304 – F	56	7	24	6	16	5	4	3
2010 – All	33	0	0	0	67	0	0	0
All hunts	51	2	16	2	30	2	3	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 9. Hunters' level of satisfaction with their opportunities to harvest an elk during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Satisfaction level							
	Very good/good		Neutral		Poor/very poor		No answer or not applicable	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	39	7	28	7	28	7	6	3
1201 – L	44	7	6	3	39	7	11	5
1301 – A	80	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
1302 – B	50	0	40	0	10	0	0	0
1303 – C	40	0	20	0	20	0	20	0
1304 – F	33	10	33	10	33	10	0	0
2101 – L	29	4	20	4	49	5	3	2
2201 – L	12	5	15	5	61	7	12	5
2301 – A	88	8	13	8	0	0	0	0
2302 – B	77	3	12	2	12	2	0	0
2303 – C	20	0	60	0	20	0	0	0
2304 – F	44	7	28	6	16	5	12	4
2010 – All	33	0	33	0	33	0	0	0
All hunts	42	2	20	2	32	2	6	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 10. Hunters' level of satisfaction with their overall hunting experience during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Satisfaction level							
	Very good/good		Neutral		Poor/very poor		No answer or not applicable	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	94	3	0	0	6	3	0	0
1201 – L	67	7	6	3	28	7	0	0
1301 – A	80	0	0	0	10	0	10	0
1302 – B	90	0	0	0	10	0	0	0
1303 – C	80	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
1304 – F	67	10	22	9	11	7	0	0
2101 – L	74	4	11	3	11	3	3	2
2201 – L	45	7	15	5	30	7	9	4
2301 – A	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2302 – B	88	2	8	2	4	1	0	0
2303 – C	80	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
2304 – F	80	5	8	4	4	3	8	4
2010 – All	67	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
All hunts	74	0	8	1	13	2	4	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 11. Proportion of hunters reporting interference from other people during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan, summarized by hunt.

Hunt – Unit	Level of interference							
	Major problem		Minor problem		No problem		No answer	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
1101 – L	6	3	28	7	67	7	0	0
1201 – L	22	6	28	7	50	8	0	0
1301 – A	0	0	20	0	80	0	0	0
1302 – B	0	0	20	0	80	0	0	0
1303 – C	0	0	0	0	80	0	20	0
1304 – F	22	9	11	7	67	10	0	0
2101 – L	9	3	26	4	63	5	3	2
2201 – L	18	6	27	6	52	7	3	2
2301 – A	13	8	25	10	50	12	13	8
2302 – B	4	1	23	3	73	3	0	0
2303 – C	0	0	0	0	80	0	20	0
2304 – F	4	3	24	6	72	6	0	0
2010 – All	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
All hunts ^b	10	1	24	2	64	2	2	1

^a95% confidence limits.

^bRow totals may equal more than 100% because rounding error.

Table 12. Proportion and number of hunters using guides and amount paid for guide services during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan.

Item	Elk hunters			
	%	95% CL ^a	Number	95% CL ^a
Used a guide	70	2	158	4
Paid for guide ^b	82	2	130	5
Amount paid for guide ^b				
\$1-100	3	1	3	1
\$101-500	37	3	48	4
\$501-1,000	54	3	70	4
\$1,001-2,000	4	1	5	1
\$2,001-3,000	0	0	0	0
More than \$3,000	0	0	0	0
Unknown	2	1	3	1

^a95% confidence limits.

^bEstimates for hunters that reported using a hunting guide.

Table 13. Proportion and number of hunters reporting various services from hunting guides during the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan.

Service provided by guide	Elk hunters ^a			
	%	95% CL ^b	Number	95% CL ^b
Hunting advice	83	2	131	5
Food	15	2	24	3
Lodging	25	2	39	3
Equipment	15	2	24	3
Selected hunt area	85	2	134	5
Removed elk from field	67	2	106	5
Delivered elk to meat processor	10	2	16	3
Processed meat	1	1	2	1

^aEstimates for hunters that reported using a hunting guide.

^b95% confidence limits.

Table 14. Proportion of elk hunters indicating various services were important when selecting an elk hunting guide in Michigan, 2010.

Service provided by guide	Level of importance									
	Very important		Somewhat important		Not important		Not sure		No answer	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
Access to area with elk	94	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	3	1
Area with good chance of taking elk	94	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
Access to private lands	67	2	22	2	4	1	3	1	4	1
Food during hunt	2	1	7	1	81	2	4	1	6	1
Lodging	5	1	15	2	69	2	6	1	6	1
Equipment	30	2	33	2	29	2	3	1	5	1
Process elk	18	2	25	2	44	2	6	1	7	1
Ethical hunter	92	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	4	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 15. Proportion of elk hunters satisfied with their hunting guide's ability to provide various services during their 2010 elk hunt in Michigan.

Service provided by guide	Satisfaction level									
	Satisfied		Neutral		Dissatisfied		Not applicable		No answer	
	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a	%	95% CL ^a
Area with good chance to see an elk	88	2	3	1	6	1	1	1	1	1
Area with good chance to take an elk	84	2	6	1	6	1	1	1	2	1
Food	16	2	20	2	1	0	57	2	6	1
Lodging	23	2	16	2	2	0	55	2	4	1
Equipment (e.g., horses, ORV, etc.)	53	2	12	1	1	0	28	2	5	1
Process elk	34	2	12	1	1	0	46	2	7	1
Ethical hunting methods	90	2	1	1	2	1	4	1	3	1

^a95% confidence limits.

Table 16. Hunters' level of satisfaction with the hunter orientation session held before the 2010 elk hunting season in Michigan.

Session item	Satisfaction level ^a							
	Satisfied		Neutral		Dissatisfied		No answer	
	%	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b	%	95% CL ^b
Session content	84	2	10	1	4	1	1	1
Facilities	80	2	12	1	7	1	1	1
Session length	78	2	14	1	7	1	1	1
Usefulness of handouts	76	2	13	1	9	1	1	1

^aRow totals may equal more than 100% because of rounding error.

^b95% confidence limits.


Appendix A

2010 Michigan Elk Harvest Questionnaire



2010 MICHIGAN ELK HUNTING SURVEY

This information is requested under authority of Part 435, 1994 PA 451, M.C.L. 324.43539.



Our survey provides you with a unique opportunity to directly affect the management of elk in Michigan. It is important that you complete this questionnaire even if you did not hunt or harvest an elk in Michigan this past year.

General Hunting Questions

1. About how many years have you hunted in Michigan? _____ Years
2. About how many years have you hunted elk prior to 2010 (including outside of Michigan)? _____ Years

Elk Hunter Orientation Program Questions

3. How satisfied were you with the elk hunter orientation session?

(Select one answer for each item listed below.)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
a. Session Content.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Facilities.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Length of session.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Usefulness of handouts (informational flyers, maps, etc.).	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>

Elk Hunting Questions

4. Did you hunt elk in Michigan during the 2010 season?

¹ ☐ Yes ² ☐ No, you are done with the survey.

5. Please report the number of days for each county that you hunted elk and the number of elk seen during your hunt period in the following table.

COUNTY HUNTED	NUMBER OF DAYS HUNTED IN SEASON	TYPE OF LAND (Record land ownership type where hunting occurred)	NUMBER OF ELK SEEN
		¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Private ² <input type="checkbox"/> Public ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Both	
		¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Private ² <input type="checkbox"/> Public ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Both	
		¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Private ² <input type="checkbox"/> Public ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Both	
		¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Private ² <input type="checkbox"/> Public ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Both	
		¹ <input type="checkbox"/> Private ² <input type="checkbox"/> Public ³ <input type="checkbox"/> Both	

6. Did you hunt with a firearm, crossbow, or bow during the 2010 elk season?
(select all that apply)

¹ ☐ Firearm ² ☐ Crossbow ³ ☐ Bow (recurve, compound, or long bow)

7. Did you take an elk and put your kill tag on the elk? (If no, please skip to question 9)

¹ ☐ Yes ² ☐ No, skip to #9

8. If your harvest tag was put on a elk, please answer the following:

- a. What was the sex of the elk?

¹ ☐ Bull ² ☐ Cow

- b. In what county was it harvested? (Please write in the county name)

- c. On what type of land was the elk harvested?

¹ ☐ Private ² ☐ Public ³ ☐ Not sure

- d. What weapon was used to harvest your elk?

¹ ☐ Firearm ² ☐ Crossbow ³ ☐ Bow (recurve, compound, or long bow)

- e. Who helped move your elk from the kill site to a vehicle? (Select all that apply)

¹ ☐ Myself ² ☐ Hunting companions ³ ☐ Guide ⁴ ☐ DNR employee ⁵ ☐ Landowner

- f. Where did you register your elk?

¹ ☐ In the field by DNR employee ² ☐ At DNR registration station

9. While you were elk hunting, how much did interference from other people affect your hunt?

¹ ☐ Major problem ² ☐ Minor problem ³ ☐ Not a problem, skip to #11

10. If you experienced interference, what was the source of the interference?

(Select all that apply)

¹ ☐ Other elk hunters ² ☐ Other hunters, not including elk hunters ³ ☐ DNR employees

⁴ ☐ Other (Please specify _____)

11. How would you rate the following for your 2010 elk hunting season:

(Select one choice per item.)

	Very Good	Good	Neutral	Poor	Very Poor	Not Applicable
a. Number of elk you saw.	¹ <input type="checkbox"/>	² <input type="checkbox"/>	³ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁴ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁵ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁶ <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Number of opportunities you had to take an elk.	¹ <input type="checkbox"/>	² <input type="checkbox"/>	³ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁴ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁵ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁶ <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Your overall elk hunting experience.	¹ <input type="checkbox"/>	² <input type="checkbox"/>	³ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁴ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁵ <input type="checkbox"/>	⁶ <input type="checkbox"/>

Questions Regarding Elk Hunter Preferences for Regulations

12. When requested by hunters, the DNR has opened gates to provide access for hunters to retrieve their elk from state land. Do you agree or disagree the DNR should continue to provide this service? (select one)

¹ ☐ Strongly Agree ² ☐ Agree ³ ☐ Not Sure ⁴ ☐ Disagree ⁵ ☐ Strongly Disagree

Elk Hunting Guide Questions

13. Did you have a guide help you during a portion or your entire elk hunt? ¹ ☐ Yes ² ☐ No, you are done with the survey.

14. Did you pay the guide for their help? ¹ ☐ Yes ² ☐ No, skip to #16

15. What did you pay your hunting guide for their help?

¹ ☐ \$1-100 ² ☐ \$101-500 ³ ☐ \$501-1,000 ⁴ ☐ \$1,001-2,000
⁵ ☐ \$2,001-3,000 ⁶ ☐ More than \$3,000 ⁷ ☐ Other (please specify: _____)

16. If you used a hunting guide, please indicate what services were provided by the guide? (Select all that apply)

¹ ☐ Hunting advice ² ☐ Food ³ ☐ Lodging ⁴ ☐ Equipment
⁵ ☐ Selected hunt area ⁶ ☐ Removed the killed elk from field ⁷ ☐ Delivered elk to meat processor ⁸ ☐ Processed meat
⁹ ☐ Other (Please specify _____)

17. What percentage of your time did the guide accompany you while elk hunting?

1 ☐ 0% 2 ☐ 1-24% 3 ☐ 25-49% 4 ☐ 50-74% 5 ☐ 75-99% 6 ☐ 100%

18. How important to you are each of the following when selecting a hunting guide for elk in Michigan?

(Select one answer for each item listed below.)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not at all Important	Not sure
a. Guide has access to hunt area with good chance of seeing elk.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Guide has access to hunt area with good chance of taking an elk.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Guide provided access to private land.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Guide provides food during hunt.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Guide provides lodging during hunt.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Guide provides equipment for hunt (horses, off-road vehicles).	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
g. Guide helps process the harvested animal.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
h. Guide uses legal and ethical hunting methods.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>
i. Other (please specify: _____)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>

19. How satisfied were you with your guide's ability to provide the following services during your elk hunt in Michigan?

(Select one answer for each item listed below.)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied	Not Applicable
a. Guide provided a hunt area with good chance of seeing elk.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Guide provided a hunt area with good chance of taking an elk.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
c. Guide provided food during hunt.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. Guide provided lodging during hunt.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
e. Guide provided equipment for hunt (horses, off-road vehicles).	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
f. Guide helps process the harvested animal.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
g. Guide used legal and ethical hunting methods.	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>
h. Other (please specify: _____)	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/>	3 <input type="checkbox"/>	4 <input type="checkbox"/>	5 <input type="checkbox"/>	6 <input type="checkbox"/>

20. Overall, did the guide increase or decrease the quality of your elk hunt? (Select one.)

1 ☐ Greatly increased 2 ☐ Increased 3 ☐ Neutral 4 ☐ Decreased 5 ☐ Greatly decreased

Please return questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Thank you for your help!

www.michigan.gov/dnre